



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,501	12/11/2001	Kerry Champion	STELP001	6519
22434	7590	01/30/2006	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			MIRZA, ADNAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/015,501	CHAMPION, KERRY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Adnan M. Mirza	2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/07/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gourraud (200200226473) and further in view of Arteaga et al (U.S. 2002/0161826).

As per claims 1,17,33,41-42,53-54,56-57 Gourraud disclosed traffic manager for facilitating communication between a client node and a server node in a distributed computing environment in accordance with at least one policy, the server node having a first interface associated therewith (Page. 5, Paragraph. 0054), the traffic manager capable of communicating with both the client code and the server node and comprising a central processing unit which is operable to: communicate with the server node via the first interface, generate and publish at least a second interface for the first interface, in accordance with said at least one policy (Page. 4, Paragraph 0042).

However Gourraud did not disclose in detail communicate with the client node via the second interface, thereby allowing the client node to access at least one service on the server node in accordance with the at least one policy.

In the same field of endeavor Arteaga disclosed, If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object (Page. 8, Paragraph. 0116).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object as taught by Arteaga in the method of Gourraud to provide a practical way for user communication devices to carry out real-time transactions and communications on such devices and processing of such transactions with a remote source such as an enterprise network server.

3. As per claims 2,18,34,43,55 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first and second interfaces comprises Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

4. As per claims 3,19 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the SOAP interfaces employ Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

5. As per claims 4,20,35 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein each of the first and second interfaces has a description language file associated therewith defining the associated interface (Gourraud, Page. 8, Paragraph. 0076).
6. As per claims 5,21,36 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first interface corresponds to one of HTTP, TCP, HTTPS, HTTPR, and MQ (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0071).
7. As per claims 6,22 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise including the server node, and wherein the client node is external to the network (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0071).
8. As per claims 7,23 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise and including both the client and server nodes (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0066).
9. As per claims 8,24,40,44 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy includes requiring authorization by a human operator for invocation of the at least one service (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
10. As per claims 9,25,41,45 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy includes 5 mapping an organizational role to a person (Arteaga, Page. 8, Paragraph. 0114).

11. As per claims 10,26,46 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the mapping of the organizational role to the person is done using an LDAP directory associated with the distributed computing environment (Arteaga, Page. 4, Paragraph. 0060).
12. As per claims 11,27,37,47 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is a security policy (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
13. As per claims 12,28,48 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with encryption or decryption of at least a portion of data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
14. As per claims 13,29,49 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with generating or verifying at least one digital signature for at least one portion of data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
15. As per claims 14,30,38,50 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with protection against service attacks (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
16. As per claims 15,31,39,51 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is associated with enforcing policies with respect to publication or access to the first or second interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

17. As per claims 16,32,40,52 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is associated with review of data communicated between the server and client nodes (Gourraud, Page. 5, Paragraph. 0043).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/07/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Response to applicant's arguments is as follows.

18. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose, "Generating or publishing a second interface in accordance with at least one policy for communication between a client and a server node. It should also be noted that the second interface that can be used to communicate with a server node.

As to applicant's argument, Arteaga disclosed, "The client device can establish a local or network connection with a web server through a data transfer protocol (Page. 3, Paragraph 0056). A SOAP envelop is preferably securely communicated from client device to the network web-server preferably via HTTPS. Within the network operating system the SOAP enveloped transaction is passed from the network web server to resource connector interfaced with SOAP parser (Page.12, Paragraph. 0157).

19. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose, “Traffic manager that can communicate with both the client and server node”.

As to applicant’s argument Arteaga disclosed, “Network web server 700 delivers applications, version updates, and necessary components via transfer protocol to a client device (Page. 6, Paragraph. 0090).

20. Applicant argued that examiner has not established a prima case of obviousness as a motivation or suggestion for combining Gourraud and Arteaga et al.

As to applicant’s argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Arteaga in the method of Gourraud to provide a practical way for user communication devices to carry out real-time transactions and communications on such devices and processing of such transactions with a remote source such as an enterprise network server.

Conclusion

21. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

23. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for un published applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).



Adnan Mirza

Examiner



JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER